

REMARKS

In accordance with the foregoing, the specification and claims 1, 6, 11, 16 and 23-24 are amended and new claim 26 is presented.

No new matter is presented, and accordingly approval and entry of the amended and new claims and the amended specification are respectfully requested.

Claims 1-2, 4-7, 9-12, 14-17 and 19-26 are pending and under consideration. Reconsideration is requested.

Amendment to the Specification

The specification is amended herein to correct an informality and indicate that "system base unit 102 carries out a line emphasis process to emphasize the lines related to the selected icon (icon information) in a step S315, "to correspond to FIG. 10. (Amendatory language underlined)

Support for the amendment is found, for example, in FIG. 10 of the specification.

No new matter is presented, and accordingly approval and entry of the amended specification are respectfully requested.

Claim Amendments

Claim 1 is amended herein to recite a system including "upon selecting an icon of a certain version, each of the lines connecting icons of other versions are displayed in a different manner than a line connecting the selected icon."

Claims 6, 11, 16 and 23-24 are amended in a similar manner.

Support for the amendment is found, for example, in Figs. 10-13 and page 21, lines 9-28 of the specification. No new matter is presented in any of the foregoing and, accordingly, approval and entry of the amended claims are respectfully requested.

Items 7-8: Rejection of claims 1-2, 4-7, 9-12, 14-17 and 19-25 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a)

In items 7-8 of the Office Action, the Examiner rejects claims 1-2, 4-7, 9-12, 14-17 and 19-25 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Fujieda (U.S.Pat. Pub 2001/0007997) in view of combinations of Chartier et al. (U.S.P. 6,636,211) and Miller et al., (U.S.P. 6,661,437). (Action at pages 3-49).

The rejection is traversed.

Independent claim 1, for example, recites a CAD generation management system connectable to a display unit, including:

- a) "a storage section . . . to store . . . each file information having a different generation before and after a modification . . .;"
 - b) "an inter-file correspondence table . . .;"
 - c) "an icon storage . . . icon data including an image representative of a CAD image corresponding to the file information;" and
 - d) "a processing unit. . . to display, . . . icon data of the file information . . . and . . . relationships of the file information corresponding to the icon data,"
 - e) ". . . a modification of one of two related units of file information . . . affects the other of the two related units of file information, including the generation information,
 - f) "the processing unit . . . displaying first lines connecting those icons of the displayed icon data that are related based on first generation information and . . . second lines connecting . . . displayed icon data that are related based on second generation information, and
 - g) "upon selecting an icon of a certain version, each of the lines connecting icons of other versions are displayed in a different manner than a line connecting the selected icon."
- (Emphasis added).

Independent claims 6, 11, 16, and 23-24 each have a similar recitation.

That is, according to an exemplary embodiment, when an icon of a certain version or version number is selected, each of the lines connecting icons of other versions can be displayed in a different manner from the line connecting the selected icon.

In other words, the manner in which each of the lines connecting the icons of the other versions can be changed from the manner in which the line connecting the selected icon is displayed so that icons of different versions are connected by mutually different kinds of lines.

As discussed in the specification, for example, according to an exemplary embodiment the width of the lines that are unrelated to the selected icon may be reduced or changed in some other manner. (See, for example, page 21, lines 9-28 of the specification.)

Applicants submit that features recited by at least each of the independent claims 1, 6, 11, 16 and 23 are not taught by even an *arguendo* combination of the art relied on by the Examiner. The Action concedes that Fujieda does not teach:

[A]n icon storage, formed by hardware, configured to store icon data corresponding to the file information; . . . icon data including an image representative of a CAD image corresponding to the file information; . . .

processing unit configured to refer to the icon storage and to display, on the display unit, icon data of the file information stored in the storage section in units of generations; and . . . corresponding to the icon data.

(See, for example, Office Action at page 7, lines 12-20).

The Action further concedes that even an *arguendo* combination of Fujieda and Chartier does not teach:

[B]y displaying first lines connecting those of the displayed data that are related based on first generation information and displaying second lines connecting those of the displayed data that are related based on second generation information.

(See, for example, Office Action at page 9, lines 15-18).

The Examiner however, relies on Aoyama's disclosure on column 8, lines 54-60 as teaching this features and that it would have been obvious to combine:

[C]ombine the teachings of the cited references because teaching Aoyama's would have allowed Fujieda's and Chartier's to provide a method to recognize how the constituent elements such as documents and program sources of projects are edited and how the elements are related to each other with respect to time, as noted by Aoyama (Column 8, lines 61-64).

(See, for example, Office Action at page 9, line 19 - page 10, line 3).

By contrast with the recitation of claim 1, Aoyama, which is relied on by the Examiner as teaching "displaying first lines . . . and displaying second lines," merely teaches:

In FIG. 16, the creation date of constituent elements is used as a reference for placement in the horizontal direction, and versions specified as elements of projects are connected to each other via a line.

(Emphasis added, See, for example, Fig. 16, and col. 54, lines 54-57).

That is, Aoyama merely teaches a line connecting elements and does not teach that "each of the lines connecting icons of other versions are displayed in a different manner than a line connecting the selected icon," as recited by claim 1. (Emphasis added).

In support of the rejection of dependent claim 9, the Examiner notes that "Figure 16 of Aoyama depicts different kinds of lines with differing widths." (See, for example, Office Action at page 19, lines 20-12).

Applicants submit, however, that the "different kinds of lines with differing width," as illustrated in Fig. 16 do not teach that "upon selecting an icon of a certain version, each of the lines connecting icons of other versions are displayed in a different manner than a line connecting the selected icon," as recited by claim 1, for example. (Emphasis added).

Thus, features recited by at least each of the independent claim 1 not taught by even an *arguendo* combination of the art relied on by the Examiner.

* * *

For the same reasons presented above in traversing the rejection of independent claim 1, Applicants submit that even an *arguendo* combination of the art of record does not teach all of the features taught by each of independent claims 6, 11, 16 and 23-24.

* * *

Dependent claims 2, 4-5, 9-10, 12, 14-15, 17, 19-22 and 25 inherit the patentable recitations of their respective base claims, and therefore, patentably distinguish over the cited art for at least the reason discussed above. In addition, the dependent claims recited additional feature not disclosed by the prior art.

Summary

Since features recited by independent claims 1, 6, 11, 16, 23, and 24 (and respective dependent claims) are not taught by even an *arguendo* combination of the art relied on by the Examiner, the rejection should be withdrawn and claims 1-2, 4-7, 9-12, 14-17 and 19-25 allowed.

New Claim

New claim 26 recites features in a different fashion. Claim 26 recites a method of performed by a processor including "selecting an icon of a version of information; and displaying connectors of unselected icons differently than connectors of the selected icon."

Support for the new claim is found, for example, in Figs. 10-13 and page 21, lines 9-28 of the specification.

No new matter is presented and, accordingly, approval and entry of the new claim are respectfully requested.

These features of claim 26 patentably distinguish over the cited art, and they are submitted to be allowable for the recitations therein.

Conclusion

There being no further outstanding objections or rejections, it is submitted that the application is in condition for allowance. An early action to that effect is courteously solicited.

Finally, if there are any formal matters remaining after this response, the Examiner is requested to telephone the undersigned to attend to these matters.

If there are any additional fees associated with filing of this Amendment, please charge the same to our Deposit Account No. 19-3935.

Respectfully submitted,

STAAS & HALSEY LLP

Date: February 24, 2009

By: Paul W. Bobowiec
Paul W. Bobowiec
Registration No. 47,431

1201 New York Avenue, N.W., 7th Floor
Washington, D.C. 20005
Telephone: (202) 434-1500
Facsimile: (202) 434-1501